

## **DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.1)**

*DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE*

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD**  
**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE**  
*June 14, 2001*  
*Richland, WA*

### **Topics in this Meeting Summary**

Committee Business.....	1
Community Relations Plan .....	3
Evaluation of HAB Public Involvement .....	6
Summary of Past HAB Advice .....	8
Announcements.....	8
Work Planning .....	8
Handouts .....	9
Attendees.....	9

*This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

### **Committee Business**

#### ***Hanford Update***

The committee discussed the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) regular contributions to the *Hanford Update*. Amber Waldref and Bill Kinsella will work on an article asking for feedback on one of the major issues the committee is working on right now: what are the best methods for involving and informing the public on the Hanford decision-making process and how can existing methods be improved? Committee members suggested establishing methods of collecting the feedback being sought, such as the Hanford website, e-mail, and the 800 number. An e-mail link on the Hanford website will be set up. Messages will be sent to EnviroIssues, which will then distribute them to the Public Involvement and Communication (PIC) Committee and the Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies: Department of Energy (DOE), Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The committee requested that an immediate response be sent to people submitting e-mail inquiries, acknowledging receipt of their message. The text of the Hanford Update article is due to EnviroIssues by June 9<sup>th</sup>. EnviroIssues will format the insert and send it on to Kim Ballinger for inclusion in the next issue.

#### ***May Meeting Summary***

The next item of committee business was to adopt the May PIC meeting summary. The committee asked that it be revised to reflect Betty Tabbutt's request for the committee to look into tours of the Hanford site. Since Bill Kinsella also requested a



substantive revision, the committee decided to approve the summary at a future conference call or meeting. Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, explained that meeting summaries are distributed two weeks after the meeting and are no longer included in the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) packet. Meeting summaries for all committees are listed on the packet document request form and are available to anyone who wishes a copy. She also explained that EnviroIssues has developed three different e-mail distribution lists for committees. There is a master list, used for distribution of formal announcements and dates of meetings and committee calls; a working list, identical to the master except it excludes some of the senior managers at the agencies and is used to distribute messages, working documents, and meeting summaries to committee members; and a leadership list composed of committee chairs and vice chairs, DOE Public Involvement support staff, agency representatives, and facilitators.

### ***Committee call***

The committee discussed rescheduling its standing committee call. However, upon discovering that the perceived conflict did not actually exist, the committee decided to keep its committee call as the third Thursday of the month at 11:30 am. This is a placeholder; if a call is not necessary it is easily cancelled. The purpose of the committee call is to help issue managers and chairs stay up to date and to develop meeting agendas.

### ***Announcements***

- The committee discussed the Tank Waste Forum being developed by Hanford Watch and DOE-Office of River Protection (DOE-ORP). This is the second forum, following up from one in February. The forum is currently scheduled for July 19.
- Greg Jones, DOE-ORP, announced upcoming Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping meetings. All meetings will be advertised in newspapers. There will be two meetings in Seattle on July 10, one in the Tri-Cities on July 11, and one in Portland on July 19. The committee pointed out a possible complication in light of the All-Star baseball game in Seattle on July 10<sup>th</sup>.
- Dennis Faulk, EPA, announced that the public comment period for the B- Reactor engineering evaluation and cost analysis is now open. Copies were available at the meeting.
- Committee member Madeleine Brown announced that Harry Anderson died the previous week. Harry Anderson had grown up in White Bluffs, fought in World War II, then returned home to find that the Hanford site had taken over his town, and his family had set up camp in Prosser. Mr. Anderson worked at Hanford and was involved in restoring the White Bluffs bank, the only building remaining in White Bluffs. His death underscores the importance of DOE speeding the cleanup process, and for the Hanford Advisory Board to address comments made during the public comment period. (At the April HAB meeting, Lyle Wilhelmi, Madeleine's husband, had asked the HAB for support in the effort to restore the White Bluffs bank.) Committee members requested more information on the issue from Madeleine and then discussed what the PIC Committee's role should be regarding testimony given during the public comment period at HAB meetings.



Members agreed that they should listen for any actions the HAB may be able to take, and agreed to discuss in a future meeting whether the HAB should respond as a Board to individuals who make public comments. It was identified as an issue for future work planning.

### ***Meeting time and frequency***

The committee discussed whether its meetings should be held during committee week or joined with the TPA Quarterly Public Involvement meetings as in the past. Concerns included ensuring the information from the TPA quarterly meetings reached the committee, making sure both the agencies and the committee had enough time to do their work, and travel cost-effectiveness.

### ***Committee discussion***

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, supported having the TPA quarterly meetings and PIC Committee meetings on the Wednesday before the HAB meeting, as long as the meetings were separated so that each had enough time. He suggested TPA quarterly meetings use two hours in the morning, and the PIC committee could meet in the afternoon.
- Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology, agreed that the TPA quarterly meetings require a separate time, not just being part of the committee's agenda. She did not voice a preference on the day.
- Ken Niles pointed out that meeting the Wednesday before the HAB meeting does not allow enough time to develop advice for the full HAB. He added that since the PIC Committee's issues are not usually time critical, this would likely not be a big problem. He suggested that the committee meet during committee week when it was planning on bringing draft advice or other products to an upcoming HAB meeting.
- Another committee member suggested an open slot for a half-day meeting floating each month.
- Gail McClure, DOE-Richland Office (DOE-RL), pointed out that a committee meeting the day before a HAB meeting would be difficult for her staff, who are busy preparing for the HAB meeting. However, she would go along with whatever meeting option the committee and other agencies chose. In response to a question about committee meetings rotating location throughout the region, she explained that that idea had been abandoned years ago in the interest of saving travel funds and time.
- Ruth Siguenza reminded the committee that meetings must be driven by the work plan and issue manager work. .

### **Community Relations Plan**

Issue Manager Betty Tabbutt discussed her concerns with the Community Relations Plan (CRP), noting that she only reviewed the Introduction and Section One. She had three general philosophical comments about the purpose of the CRP.



1. Is the purpose of the plan to serve as a user-friendly citizen's guide or a prescriptive document for the TPA agencies that would qualify as a public participation plan under the state's Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA)? Betty thought the document should be prescriptive, but that it could simultaneously be a citizen's guide by including sidebar information for the public.
2. The second issue was how to align the CRP with the public participation plan required under MTCA. Betty suggested including a section explaining how the TPA agencies make information available to the public, and a section explaining how the public gets input to the agencies, and how the public knows its concerns have been addressed.
3. The third issue was Betty's desire to include a section on site tours, since they are such an important way for the public and for important decision makers (including Congressional staff) to get information on Hanford. Betty suggested including a subsection to the plan titled "Tours of the Hanford Site." She emphasized that tours should be considered mobile public meetings, and thus should include accurate, consistent, balanced info from all TPA agencies.

### **Committee Discussion**

- Who currently runs tours? DOE and its contractors.
- Not all committee members agreed that all three TPA agencies should be required to participate in site tours. The committee decided it needed to devote more time to discussing tours, taking into consideration the wide range of groups interested in the site.
- Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, expressed umbrage at some committee members' allegations that that DOE is not/would not be truthful on site tours. She said the current tour system is working pretty well. However, one committee member reported that in April he had attended a Saturday afternoon tour on which the guide made several false statements, leaving tour attendees with the impression that the site was cleaner and safer than it really is. DOE staff and other committee members were surprised to hear this report. The committee agreed that it needed to discuss in greater detail how tours are conducted. The committee decided that the CRP should encourage tours and scripts should be reviewed and approved with input from the TPA agencies.
- The committee added site tours to its work plan, with Betty Tabbutt and Madeleine Brown as issue managers. They agreed to learn about the chain of accountability on site tours. The DOE contact is Mary Goldie.
- The committee supported Betty's idea for including a section on responsiveness in the CRP.

### **Regulator Perspectives**

#### **Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

- Dennis Faulk, EPA, explained that the CRP is written as a citizen's guide, thus fulfilling Section 10 of the TPA, which requires a public involvement plan. The EPA would not agree to the prescriptive language suggested by Betty Tabbutt in CRP.



- Regarding tours, Dennis commented that sometimes it is not appropriate to include DOE on tours given by the EPA. He would not agree language that required regulators to be on all site tours.
- Dennis offered to write a section on tours for the CRP for inclusion in the draft that will be available for public comment this summer. He also commented that the three agencies would need to look at a script, but that if a tour guide needs a script then maybe they should not be a tour guide.
- Dennis urged the committee to issue formal advice on the CRP in September.

### **Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology)**

- Joy Turner, Ecology, reported that Ecology does give some tours, as they are one of the best ways to inform people about issues on the site. Ecology would not have problems with including DOE or EPA on tours, but she noted that it might be difficult to find language agreeable to the whole committee.

Gerry Pollet explained his perspectives on the relationship between the Community Relations Plan and MTCA. He said that MTCA requires public notice and hazard communication to potentially exposed groups and public comment on institutional controls that may be required. For Hanford, that has never really happened. A MTCA public involvement plan must address 1) land use 2) exposure 3) resources impacted, and 4) potential restrictions on those resources. Such input is required if there is to be any site-specific risk assessment.

Gerry Pollet pointed out that to adequately follow MTCA, the whole act must be included in the CRP, not just the public involvement section. He also alleged that 100 Area cleanup is in violation of MTCA, and the related Records of Decision (RODs) are in violation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and MTCA, because the site did not use the standard defaults. The committee asked for Ecology's response to these allegations. Joy Turner, Ecology, said that she was not the proper person to comment on that. Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that Gerry Pollet had outlined the requirements, which EPA met under its Superfund feasibility study. There were some input requirements in MTCA that were not used. Dennis noted that it turns out, from a cleanup impact perspective, it did not matter. Gerry urged the committee to look at whether notices meet public requirements about land use and resource restrictions. He felt new language and new steps are needed because DOE-RL is definitely using site-specific risk assessment. Gerry and Betty proposed specific language in a memo shared with the committee. The committee asked agency representatives for their perspectives on adding prescriptive MTCA language to the CRP.

- Marla Marvin, DOE-RL, reported that DOE's lawyers would have to look at whether adding prescriptive language would be acceptable.
- Joy Turner, Ecology, commented that Ecology would like the CRP to include a reference to MTCA, and would like the CRP to suffice for the public participation plan required in MTCA. She would have to read the language very closely.



- Dennis Faulk, EPA, said that EPA cleanup occurs under not just MTCA, but CERCLA as well. He forecast that EPA's attorneys would have to get involved to decide specific language, and there would likely be legal issues.

### ***Committee discussion of CRP Advice***

- The committee discussed whether or not to issue advice on the CRP, and how detailed the advice should be. Members agreed not to try to pass CRP wordsmithing advice through the full HAB. Dennis Faulk suggested the committee issue policy advice about the new MTCA regulations, which would remind the agencies to pay attention to it. Ecology and DOE-RL both agreed that advice issued at the September HAB meeting would be helpful.
- The committee debated beginning advice with a paragraph saying that prescriptive elements of MTCA should be followed. It was suggested that subsequent paragraphs call for public notices to include the appropriate level of detail so the public would understand impacts and be aware of public meetings.
- Betty Tabbutt reiterated that advice should ask for clarity on how the public receives and contributes information and how it knows if its concerns have been addressed.
- Committee members suggested reordering sections of the CRP to be in a more logical order.
- Dennis Faulk said it would not be a problem to include the document "Evaluation of Public Participation" drafted by Ken Niles, Doug Huston and Deanna Henry, but that the agencies need to decide who will take responsibility for the evaluation so Section 10 of the TPA can be updated.
- A committee member requested that the CRP inform people that their comment cards will be used in the annual evaluation.
- Another committee member suggested including a study of the cost effectiveness of public participation. Another suggestion was to ask attendees how they heard about specific public involvement meetings.

Betty Tabbutt, Amber Waldref, and Susan Leckband will work on drafting general CRP advice to be discussed at the next committee conference call.

### **Evaluation of HAB Public Involvement**

Issue Manager Bill Kinsella distributed two handouts ("Evaluating Hanford Advisory Board Public Involvement and Communication Activities" and "Template for Evaluating Public Involvement and Communication Activities"). He thanked Mary Anne Weunnecke, Ecology, for contributing information about Ecology's public involvement activities. Bill would like to assemble a complete list of the activities sponsored by the TPA agencies, as well as activities conducted by interest groups. Agency representatives and committee members agreed to submit completed templates to EnviroIssues by the end of June. Gail McClure, DOE-RL, was doubtful that DOE-RL would be able to submit its information within this timeframe. EnviroIssues will then transmit the comments to Bill, who will compile the results and write a short white paper summarizing the committee's discussions and discoveries.



### ***Committee discussion***

- Dennis Faulk expressed support of the template, remarking that it could be a good working tool because it helps show that agencies do broader public outreach, rather than just public meetings. He also thought the template would make it easier to improve public involvement. He suggested choosing two or three public involvement activities to focus on improving, such as the annual budget meetings.
- Dennis noted that one of the biggest problems with public involvement is that the same discussions keep happening. He thought the table could serve as a framework to track improvements. He offered to fill out the EPA portion of the table.
- A committee member asked whether the template was to be used as input to the Tri-Party agencies' annual evaluation of public involvement for the end of the fiscal year. Bill responded that it could serve that role, though he had intended for it to serve as a broad level evaluation of all public involvement activities.
- A committee member asked for clarification on the annual TPA public involvement evaluation – who reads it, who is the target audience, what is its impact, and does it reach Washington, D.C.? Gail McClure, DOE-RL, answered that the report goes back to DOE. Dennis added that the evaluation is useful as an institutional record of improvements to public involvement that have been made over the years. Mary Anne Wuennecke noted that the evaluation is useful within each agency as well. She explained that the evaluation is mailed to about 100 people – HAB members, agency senior managers, and others contacts from the TPA agencies. The evaluation consists of three sections: public, public involvement staff, and agency management. Ecology placed an advertisement in the newspaper announcing the evaluation and inviting comments last year but received no responses. The committee suggested distributing the survey by e-mail.
- Mary Anne explained that although the evaluation is annual, it is not due on a fixed date. The last one had been completed in May 2000. Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues, commented that previous HAB chair Merrilyn Reeves had considered the December HAB meeting as an opportunity for annual evaluation; Ruth suggested the committee consider that as a timeframe for this piece of work.
- A committee member suggested adding column for “Goals” to the template.
- The committee discussed developing evaluation criteria. Marla Marvin brought up the point of whether relevant information is collected from a public meeting, i.e., whether it was the right event to collect the information being sought. Bill suggested that evaluation criteria include relevance, usefulness, impact, and use.
- Ruth Siguenza pointed out that the evaluation could address two separate aspects of public involvement – the process (availability, openness, ease of participation) and the content or substance of the issues of concern.
- A committee member noted that some benefits of public participation are impossible to measure for benefits. Often the public has no power other than to attend public meetings and exercise its freedom of speech and experience a public catharsis. He warned the committee not to think it can totally evaluate the usefulness of public meetings.



- The committee discussed possible products for input to TPA annual evaluation. Ecology agreed to wait for input from the HAB, since the TPA agencies need time to finish draft CRP revisions, collect public comments, and run the evaluation afterward. The committee will discuss the issue during its July committee call. The white paper will be submitted to the HAB in December.

### **Summary of Past HAB Advice**

The committee discussed the summary of past HAB Advice that Ken Niles had produced for the public budget meetings earlier in the year. Ken Niles said that the HAB would need to decide on a method for updating the summary on an ongoing basis. He added that it represents only one person's perception of important elements of HAB advice; he suggested a small group representing the whole HAB review the summary annually. The committee agreed and further suggested that the summary could serve as a companion piece to the HAB Annual Progress Report. Ken agreed to write a memo to the HAB chair Todd Martin and PIC committee chair Amber Waldref, and then consult the Executive Issues Management Group.

### **Announcements**

- Gail McClure will be out for a few weeks; concerns should be directed to Kim Ballinger.
- Mary Anne Weunnecke announced that every other page was missing from the copy of Ecology's Nuclear Waste Program Public Involvement Plan she had brought for distribution. She apologized and promised to e-mail the complete document to EnviroIssues for distribution to the full committee.

### **Work Planning**

Committee chair Amber Waldref listed several issues the committee may want to include on its work plan, but since many issue managers and committee members were not in attendance, the committee decided to do its work planning in a future meeting or conference call. Marla Marvin encouraged the committee to focus its energy on a few important issues. The committee decided that over the summer, it would focus on discussing tours of the site, the Community Relations Plan, and the evaluation of public involvement for the TPA agencies.

The committee decided to cancel its June committee call since there will be no meeting in July. Amber Waldref and Bill Kinsella will be the representatives on the Executive Issues Management Group conference call, scheduled for 3:00 pm on June 21<sup>st</sup>. The committee confirmed that its next committee call would occur on July 19<sup>th</sup> unless it hears otherwise from Bill Kinsella concerning a possible conflict with the Hanford Watch Tank Waste Forum.



## **Handouts**

- Public Involvement and Communication Committee Draft Meeting Agenda v1, June 14, 2001
  - Evaluating Hanford Advisory Board Public Involvement and Communication Activities, by Bill Kinsella, May 16, 2001
  - Template for Evaluating Public Involvement and Communication Activities, by Bill Kinsella, May 24, 2001
  - Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis “Proposed Cleanup Plan for Hanford’s B Reactor Facility” Request for Public Comment, by the Tri-Party Agencies, June 2001
  - Washington State Department of Ecology’s Nuclear Waste Program Public Involvement Outreach Plan (missing even numbered pages)
  - Hanford Update August/September Issue timeline, June 14, 2001
  - Draft Proposed Language for the TPA Community Relations Plan, June 14, 2001
  - Letter from Gerry Pollet and Betty Tabbutt to Agency staffs and persons interested in CRP revision RE: Proposed language for additions/revisions to Community Relations Plan to incorporate MTCA requirements and other comments given over past few years, June 14, 2001
  - Strikethrough version of changes to the Community Relations Plan, June 14, 2001
- 

## **Attendees**

### **HAB Members and Alternates**

Madeleine Brown	Deanna Henry	Bill Kinsella
Susan Leckband	Ken Niles (phone)	Gerry Pollet
Gordon Rogers	Leon Swenson (phone)	Betty Tabbutt (phone)
Jim Trombold	Amber Waldref	

### **Others**

Mary Goldie, DOE-RL	Fred Jamison, Ecology	Kim Ballinger, Critique
Marla Marvin, DOE-RL	Joy Turner, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Mary Anne Wuennecke, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Andrea Powell, DOE-RL	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Barbara Wise, FH
Al Hawkins, DOE-ORP		Annette Carlson, Nuvotec
Greg Jones, DOE-ORP		